

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 4-9, and 11-53 are pending in the present application, Claims 3 and 10 having been previously canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, Claims 1, 7, 8, and 15 having been amended, and Claims 35-53 having been previously withdrawn from consideration. Support for the amendments to Claims 1, 8, and 15 is found, for example, in Fig. 71. The amendment to Claim 7 corrects an antecedent basis informality. Accordingly, no new matter is added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1-2, 4-9, 11-19, 21-28, and 30-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Bhukhanawala (U.S. Patent No. 5,831,617) in view of Hug et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,806,078, hereinafter Hug); and Claims 20 and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Bhukhanawala in view of Hug, and further in view of Gupta et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,546,405, hereinafter Gupta).

With respect to the outstanding rejections of independent Claims 1, 8, and 15, Applicants have amended Claims 1, 8, and 15 to recite, *inter alia*, “said electronic label including an alarm which is activated at a preset time.” Applicants respectfully submit that neither Bhukhanawala, Hug, nor Gupta disclose or suggest this element of Claims 1, 8, and 15.

In a non-limiting embodiment of the claimed invention, in an application program, realized on a desktop screen of a personal computer, the operation of using a tag (i.e, a post-it note or similar tag) on a paper document is adapted for use on a computer screen with electronic labels. The electronic label is displayed on the desktop with object information (such as text, symbols, still pictures, or sound) and time information.¹

¹ Specification, page 34, lines 1-10.

In the non-limiting embodiment claimed invention, where the label has the concept of time, it is possible to associate a label with an alarm to ring at a preset time. This alarm rings irrespective of the current desktop display time, such that, even when the state of past or future label states are displayed, the alarm is rung to avoid the risk of overlooking crucial label information.²

Bhukhanawala discloses a method of browsing through different versions of a file in a movie-like fashion. The outstanding Office Action has equated the claimed “electronic label” to the “container icon” or “movie icon” of Bhukhanawala.³ However, there is no description or suggestion in Bhukhanawala that the “container icon” or “movie icon” includes an alarm. Furthermore, a person of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to include an alarm with the “container icon” or “movie icon.” The “container icon” or “movie icon” enables users, when the “container icon” or “movie icon” is double clicked, to display a current version of a document or image. The user can then “rewind” in a movie like fashion to an earlier version of the document or image.⁴ The “movie icon” or “container icon” does not serve as a reminder to a user since the user must actively launch the program associated with the “container icon” or “movie container.” Since the user launched the program, there is nothing the user needs a reminder for, and there is no reason to have an alarm to prevent the user from overlooking crucial label information.

Hug does not cure the above-noted deficiencies in Bhukhanawala. Hug describes a version management system that stores an original version of a document, and alternative versions are stored in a delta format.⁵ There is no description or suggestion of an alarm included in a label.

² Specification, page 89, lines 2-11.

³ Office Action, page 3.

⁴ Bhukhanawala, col. 7, lines 1-9.

⁵ Hug, Abstract.

Application No. 09/575,104
Reply to Office Action of December 27, 2005

In view of the above-noted distinctions, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1, 8, and 15 (and Claims 2, 4-7, 9, 11-34) patentably distinguish over Bhukhanwala and Hug, taken alone or in proper combination.

Consequently, in light of the above discussion, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

Joseph Wrkich
Registration No. 53,796

I:\ATTY\JW\203738US\203738US_AM DUE 3-27-06.DOC